

Remarks

**Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,274,698 (Jang).** Claim 7 has been clarified by amendment to further distinguish Jang. Jang teaches a system for classifying callers and then restricting calls based on the called number. (See Jang, column 4, lines 32-65). The first step in Jang is to classify the caller – possibly by caller number. The second step in Jang is to restrict the call based on the called number.

In contrast in Claim 7, the first step is processing the called telephone number to determine if the caller needs to be validated, and the second step is processing the caller number in a validation table if necessary. This is the opposite of Jang. In Jang, the caller number is used first to classify the caller, and called number is used second to restrict the call. In claim 7, the called telephone number is used first to classify the call, and caller telephone number may be used second to validate the caller. The following table illustrates these differences.

	Processed First	Processed Second
<b>Jang</b>	The <u>caller</u> number is processed first to classify the <u>caller</u> .	The <u>called</u> number is processed second to deny the call
<b>Claim 7</b>	The <u>called</u> number is processed first to classify the call as toll-free or not	The <u>caller</u> number may be processed second to deny the call

The following language is quoted from claim 7:

“if the called telephone number is not toll-free, then checking the caller telephone number in a validation table to determine if the call should be allowed ..... if the called telephone number is toll-free, then processing the called telephone number to select the route for the call without checking the caller telephone number in the validation table.”

Jang does not disclose this method. Applicants request that the Examiner provide specific citations to Jang where the above method is taught.

**Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Jang in view of U.S. Patent 5,592,477 (Farris).** Claim 8 has been clarified by amendment to further distinguish Jang and Farris. Although SS7 IAMs are well known, the system of Jang is a key/PBX system (See Jang, Abstract), which is Customer Premise Equipment (CPE). The CPE in Jang receives DTMF tones from the caller's telephone, and would not receive SS7 IAMs from the caller's telephone. Regardless of how well known SS7 is, those skilled in the art would clearly not be motivated to modify Jang so the caller telephones transfer SS7 IAMs to the CPE instead of DTMF tones. SS7 is a complex and highly fault tolerant signaling protocol that is used within complex telecommunication networks like Farris. SS7 is typically not deployed in CPE, and SS7 is certainly not deployed in caller telephones. If Jang and Farris were combined, then the caller telephone would have to produce SS7 IAMs instead of DTMF tones. Farris would not motivate those skilled in the art to add SS7 complexity to the caller telephones in Jang.

Applicants submit that there are numerous additional reasons in support of patentability, but that such reasons are moot in light of the above remarks and are omitted in the interests of brevity. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 7-8.

  
**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Michael J. Setter, Reg. No. 37,936  
Duft Setter Ollila & Bornsen  
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 13  
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

**Correspondence address:**

**CUSTOMER NO. 28004**

Attn: Harley R. Ball  
6391 Sprint Parkway  
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100  
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100